

Exhibit 15

From: Hung Ta
Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 7:32 PM
To: Jeffrey C. Block
Cc: Jacob Walker; Samuel Rudman; Luke Olts; Reed Kathrein
Subject: RE: Tezos - fee allocation

No.

From: Jeffrey C. Block <jeff@blockleviton.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 7:15 PM
To: Hung Ta <hta@hgtlaw.com>
Cc: Jacob Walker <jake@blockleviton.com>; Samuel Rudman <SRudman@rgrdlaw.com>; Luke Olts <LOlts@rgrdlaw.com>; Reed Kathrein <reed@hbsslaw.com>
Subject: Re: Tezos - fee allocation

Hung,

We suggest that before we burden the Court with a fee allocation dispute, that we consider using a neutral (such as Layn who is familiar with the case) to help resolve this disagreement. I am sure the Court would appreciate our attempting to resolve this before seeking the Court's intervention.

Let us know.

Jeff

Jeffrey C. Block
Block & Leviton LLP
260 Franklin Street, Suite 1860
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 398-5600
jeff@blockleviton.com | <https://www.BlockLeviton.com>

This e-mail message is intended only for the personal use of the recipient(s) named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication and as such privileged and confidential and/or it may include attorney work product. If you are not an intended recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message.

From: Hung Ta <hta@hgtlaw.com>
Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 at 10:25 AM

To: Jeffery Block <jeff@blockleviton.com>

Subject: Tezos - fee allocation

Jeff,

I got your voicemail.

This is our proposal for the allocation of the attorneys' fees. The fees should be allocated based on the collective lodestar of our group (HGT Law, LTL Attorneys, Lite DePalma and Restis Law Firm), versus the collective lodestar of your group (Block & Leviton, Robbins Geller, Hagens Berman and Taylor-Copeland) – an approximately 57% to 43% split. This is our best and final (and only) offer.

If you disagree with this proposal, we will file a motion with the Court and request that Judge Seeborg determine the appropriate allocation. In the event of such a motion, we would be entitled to seek from the Court a percentage that is greater than our group's collective lodestar. This would be based on the actual value of the contributions of the respective groups to the litigation and the settlement (as opposed to just the nominal amount of the groups' respective lodestars), and also recognizes that, as the Defendants repeatedly asserted at the mediation before Layn Phillips, the State Court Litigation was "dead in the water" and worthless.

Please let us know your position.



Hung G. Ta
250 Park Avenue, 7th Floor
New York, New York 10177
Tel: +1 (646) 453-7290
Fax: +1 (646) 453-7289
Web: www.hgtlaw.com

=====

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient(s), or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this message to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message from your computer.

=====